Application Serial No.: 10/574,866

Applicant: Paul Brian KISER

Response to Office Action mailed: July 21, 2009

Response Filed: August 19, 2009

**REMARKS** 

United States Serial No. 10/574,866 is a national stage application of International

Docket No.: GIV.P30095

Application No. PCT/CH2004/000622, filed October 13, 2004, which claims the benefit

of U.S. Serial No. 60/511,539, filed October 15, 2003. The date of entry into the national

stage of United States Serial No. 10/574.866 is April 6, 2006. A preliminary amendment

was also filed on April 6, 2006 upon entering the national stage. The 371(c) date (date of

date of receipt of the 35 U.S.C. §371(c)(1), (c)(2) and (c)(4) requirements and date of

completion of all 35 U.S.C. §371 requirements) is October 18, 2006.

Claims 1-6 are pending. An Office Action mailed July 21, 2009 has subjected

claims 1-6 to a restriction requirement. Applicant has made the necessary election in

response to the restriction requirement, discussed in detail below. In view of the

traversing arguments set forth herein. Applicant respectfully requests that alleged Groups

I and II within claims 1-6 be rejoined and allowed.

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In the Office Action mailed July 21, 2009, the Examiner required Applicant to

elect one of the following Groups based on 35 U.S.C. §121:

Group I (claims 1-3): drawn to a method of preparing food.

Group II (claims 4-6): drawn to a container.

2

Application Serial No.: 10/574,866

Applicant: Paul Brian KISER

Response to Office Action mailed: July 21, 2009

Response Filed: August 19, 2009

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicant elects to prosecute the claims

Docket No.: GIV.P30095

of Group I, drawn to a method of preparing food (claims 1-3), and traverses the

restriction for the reasons set forth below.

The Office Action alleges that the claims of Groups I and II are independent or

distinct from each other because the method as claimed in Group I does not require the

apparatus as claimed in Group II. In this regard, the Office Action alleges that the

method could be performed by spraying the seasoning mixture onto the food product or

applying the seasoning mixture by hand. The Office Action also alleges that the

apparatus as claimed in Group II could be used in a method other than that recited in

Group I. In this regard, the Office Action alleges that the apparatus could be used in a

method wherein the food is cooked in the container.

In view of the fact that the present application is a 35 U.S.C. §371 national stage

application based on an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperative

Treaty (PCT), Applicant respectfully submits that the proper standard for applying a

restriction requirement is based on the unity of invention standard recited in PCT.

Rule 13.1 of the Regulations under the PCT allows for the inclusion of different

groups in the same international application when the subject matter of those different

groups are so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity

of invention"). The unity of invention standard is defined in Rule 13.2 of the Regulations

under the PCT which states that unity of invention exists when there is a technical

3

Application Serial No.: 10/574,866

Applicant: Paul Brian KISER

Response to Office Action mailed: July 21, 2009

Response Filed: August 19, 2009

relationship among the claimed inventions involving the same "special technical

Docket No.: GIV.P30095

features". Rule 13.2 further defines "special technical features" as those technical

features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions considered as a

whole, makes over the prior art.

In the present case, Applicant's respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to

allege that the claims of Group I and II do not share a special technical feature which

would define a contribution over the prior art. Furthermore, the claims of Groups I and II

would not pose an additional search burden on the Office since a method for preparing a

foodstuff and a container for containing a foodstuff are intertwined with each other in that

they both relate to food preparation.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the

restriction requirement between Groups I and Group II, and requests the issuance of a

formal notice of allowance directed to claims 1-6.

4

Docket No.: GIV.P30095 Application Serial No.: 10/574.866

Applicant: Paul Brian KISER

Customer No. 23575

Response to Office Action mailed: July 21, 2009

Response Filed: August 19, 2009

Should the Examiner have any questions about the above remarks, the undersigned attorneys would welcome a telephone call.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph G. Curatolo, Esq. (Reg. No. 28,837) Peter R. Detorre, Esq. (Reg. No. 61,801)

Curatolo Sidoti Co., LPA

24500 Center Ridge Road, Suite 280

Cleveland, OH 44145

Telephone: 440.808.0011 Facsimile: 440.808.0657 Attornevs for Applicant

august 19, 2009